

Application No.: 10/804,635  
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2005

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sipe (522). The Examiner asserts that the disclosure of Sipe provides a complete response to each and every element set forth in the claims. The Examiner asserts that Figures 1, 3, 7 and 9 show a plurality of terminals 127, compliant sections 128, a main board 910, a plurality of sub-boards 130 equipped with lands 332, 326, contact sections 310, a mating connector 200 and a housing 110, 120, 140.

Applicants respectfully contend that the reference does not teach the combination of elements recited in claims 1-3. Each of these claims recites, inter alia, a plurality of terminals equipped with compliant sections to be inserted into through holes in a main board. Sipe neither teaches nor suggests compliant sections to be inserted into through holes in a main board. Sipe instead teaches a single prong 128 extending down through the base 120 to be connected to a board, usually by soldering, as shown in Figure 1 and described beginning in column 3 at line 67. Since Sipe does not teach nor suggest the use of compliant sections to be inserted into through holes in a main board, his connector does not have one of the issues which the invention of the application seeks to address, namely, buckling of the lower end of the sub-boards when the terminals are press fit into the through holes in the main board. In contradistinction, the invention provides an electrical connector which can be mounted more reliably on the main board through the use of terminals having compliant sections to be inserted into through holes in the main board. Since Sipe does not teach nor suggest compliant sections as claimed in combination with the other elements of claims 1-3, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/804,635  
Reply to Office Action of May 10, 2005

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sipe in view of McGrath et al. The Examiner correctly asserts that Sipe does not show a part of the land which is close to the edge and is narrower than the remainder of the land. As discussed above, Sipe also does not teach nor suggest compliant sections of the terminals to be inserted into through holes in a main board as recited in independent claim 3 from which the rejected claims depend. The Examiner therefore has not made a prima facie showing of obviousness since neither of the Sipe nor McGrath references teach nor suggest this element in combination with the elements of claims 4-6. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested.

For all of the foregoing reasons Applicants respectfully contend that the application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-6, and issuance of a Patent for the subject invention. Please charge any additional requisite fees relating to this amendment and response to Deposit Account No. 501581.

Respectfully submitted,



\_\_\_\_\_  
Salvatore Anastasi  
Registration No. 39,090  
Attorney for Applicants  
Phone: 610.722.3899  
Facsimile: 610.889.3696

PTO Customer No.: 29450